

Appl. No. 10/665,995  
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2006  
Reply to Advisory Action of June 26, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Claims 11-13 are amended for clearer definition over the art of record. Claims 14-22 are newly added in the current amendment.

Support for the changes thereto can be found in the drawings and within the claims themselves as filed originally. Specifically, as illustrated in FIGS. 1-5, prisms 11 (diffusion elements) are configured at an outside (surface) of the diffusion plate 3025. Meanwhile, claims 11 and 13 establish the stacking order of the elements in question.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103***

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kretman et al US 6,497,946 (hereinafter Kretman) in view of Yoshida et al US 6,882,711 (hereinafter Yoshida).

Responsive to the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kretman et al '946 in view of Yoshida et al '711, Applicants have amended claims 11 and 12 and hereby traverse this rejection and submit that claims 11 and 12 are novel and unobvious over Kretman et al '946, Yoshida et al '711, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Appl. No. 10/665,995  
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2006  
Reply to Advisory Action of June 26, 2006

Claim 11, as currently amended, recites in part:

A backlight system ...

light conversion elements are configured at an outside of  
the diffusion plate ... , the outside of the diffusion plate  
facing toward the reflection polarizer and being opposite  
to the portion of diffusion plate stacked on the light guide  
plate. (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that such a backlight system as set forth in claim 11, as currently amended is neither taught, disclosed nor suggested by Kretman et al '946, Yoshida et al '711, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Applicants submit that neither Kretman nor Yoshida has taught, suggested or disclosed "light conversion elements [are] configured at an outside of the diffusion plate ...", as particularly forth in claim 11, as amended (Emphasis added). Applicants further submit that "configured at an outside of the diffusion plate" as set forth in claim 11, as currently amended, has sufficiently excluded the situation of "formed in the diffusion layer" taught by Yoshida. Applicants note the Examiner had contended Kretman as that "the light scattering particles are formed on an

Appl. No. 10/665,995  
Amtd. Dated July 18, 2006  
Reply to Advisory Action of June 26, 2006

inner surface of the film ...” (Page 2 of Office Action mailed on April 19, 2006). Applicants submit that the present backlight system, as set forth in claim 11, as currently amended, is sufficiently patentable over Kretman, Yoshida, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowable.

Similarly, claim 12, as currently amended, recites in part:

A method of making a backlight system, comprising ...

**forming a plurality of light conversion elements on an outside surface of said diffusion plate, ... the outside surface of the diffusion plate facing toward the reflection polarizer and being opposite to the portion of diffusion plate positioned above the light guide plate. (Emphasis added.)**

Likewise, claim 13, as currently amended, recites in part:

A backlight system, comprising ...

**light conversion elements are configured at an outside surface of the diffusion plate, the outside surface of the diffusion plate facing toward the reflection polarizer and**

Appl. No. 10/665,995  
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2006  
Reply to Advisory Action of June 26, 2006

**being opposite to the portion of diffusion plate stacked on  
the light guide plate.**

Applicant submits that such a backlight system and such a method for making the same, as set forth in claims 12 and 13, respectively, are neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Kretman '946, Yoshida '711, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

As set forth in the arguments with respect to claim 1, Kretman '946 and Yoshida '711, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a plurality of light conversion elements configured at/on an outside surface of the diffusion plate in the manner specifically provided in amended claims 12 or 13.

As claims 12 and 13 require similar limitations as those set forth above with respect to claim 11, Applicants submit that claims 12 and 13 are also allowable over Kretman et al '946 and Yoshida et al '711.

Accordingly, claims 11-13 are submitted to be novel, unobvious, and patentable over Kretman et al '946 and Yoshida et al '711. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 11-13 are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/665,995  
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2006  
Reply to Advisory Action of June 26, 2006

Newly added claims 14-22 are directly or indirectly dependent from claims 11 or 13, therefore should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tai-Cheng Yu et al

By   
Jeffrey T. Knapp

Registration No.: 45,384  
Foxconn International, Inc.  
1650 Memorex Drive  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel. No.: 714/626-1229